



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,944	12/12/2003	Michael V. Crodoba	2008.007300/03-0446.00	1467

23720 7590 04/04/2005

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100
HOUSTON, TX 77042

EXAMINER

MAI, SON LUU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2827

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.A

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/734,944	CRODOBA, MICHAEL V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Son L. Mai	2827	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,21-25,32 and 38-45 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-20,26-31,33-37,46 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the word "Transalator" should read – Translator--. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2827

3. Claims 2-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 2, the recitation "said first one-shot circuit" in line 4 lacks antecedent basis in the claim. It should read ~~—said first one-shot—~~. Second, "said control signal" in line 6 lacks antecedent basis. Perhaps the Applicant means, "said input signal" for referring to an input signal in claim 1. Third, "a second one-shot circuit" in line 7 should read ~~—said second one-shot—~~because it refers to a second one-shot in claim 1. Fourth, "a first voltage range" and "a second voltage range" in line 11 should read ~~—said first voltage range—~~and ~~—said second voltage range—~~because they refer to "a first voltage range" and "a second voltage range" in claim 1.

As to claim 7, the language is misdescriptive. The "drain" should be ~~—source—~~ because as shown in figure 5, the source terminals (not the drain terminals) of the transistors 520 and 570 are coupled to Vcc.

As to claim 9, the language is confusing. Which pair of transistors is coupled to the drain terminals of first and second transistors (520, 570 in figure 5)?

As to claim 11, the recitation "said second voltage level" in line 2 lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

As to claim 12, the recitation "said second voltage level" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

As to claim 13, the recitation "said first voltage level" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

As to claim 15, "said second voltage level" in line 4 lacks antecedent basis. Second, "said first control signal" in lines 5-6 lacks antecedent basis. Third, it is not clear if there exists a first N-channel transistor having a source terminal coupled to a control signal as recited in line 5-6. As seen in figure 6, the first N-channel transistor is transistor 660 which has its source terminal coupled to the ground.

As to claim 16, "said second voltage level" in line 4 lacks antecedent basis. Second, "said first control signal" in lines 5-6 lacks antecedent basis. Third, "said first N-channel transistor" in line 5 lacks antecedent basis. Fourth, it is not clear if there exists a first (third?) N-channel transistor having a source terminal coupled to a control signal as recited in line 5-6. As seen in figure 6, the first (third?) N-channel transistor is transistor 660 which has its source terminal coupled to the ground. Fifth, "said a complement of said input signal" in lines 9-10 should read --said complementary signal of said input signal--.

As to claim 26, the recitation "The circuit of claim 21" should read --The voltage level translator--.

As to claim 27, the recitation "said second voltage level" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

As to claim 28, the recitation "said first voltage level" lacks antecedent basis in the claim.

As to claims 30 and 31, they are identical to claims 15 and 16 and contain the same deficiencies as claims 15 and 16, respectively.

Art Unit: 2827

As to claim 33, "said first one-shot circuit" in line 4 should read --said first one-shot--. Second, "said control signal" in line 6 should read --said input signal--. Third, "a second one-shot circuit" in line 7 should read -- a second one-shot--. Fourth, "a first voltage range" and "a second voltage range" in line 11 should read --said first voltage range--and --said second voltage range--for referring to voltage ranges in claim 32.

As to claims 36 and 37, they contain the same deficiencies as claims 15 and 16, respectively.

As to claims 46 and 47, they contain the same deficiencies as claims 15 and 16, respectively.

Claims 3-20 and 27-31 are rejected because in their dependency they include the limitations of base claim 2.

Claims 34-37 are rejected because in their dependency they include the limitations of base claim 33.

Double Patenting

4. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

5. Claims 30 and 31 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 15 and 16. Claims 27-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as

Art Unit: 2827

being a substantial duplicate of claims 27-29. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1, 21-25, 32, 38-45 are allowed.
7. Claims 2-20, 26-31, 33-37, 46 and 47 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a method and a circuit for performing a voltage level translation of an input signal. In particular, a circuit comprises: a transistor circuitry for receiving an input signal for translating a signal from a first voltage range to a second voltage range; and a first one-shot and a second one-shot to provide at least one pulse for translating said input signal from said first voltage range to said second voltage range.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references cited in form PTO-892 teach voltage level translation circuits and methods for converting an input signal from a first voltage range to a second voltage range.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son L. Mai whose telephone number is 571-272-1786. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoai Ho can be reached on 571-272-1777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

03-31-05



Son L. Mai
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2827